

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ANDREW J. ARRINGTON, *et al.*,)
)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
)
v.) Civil Action No. 14-885
)
)
ERNESTINE McRAE, *et al.*,) Judge Cathy Bissoon
)
)
Defendants,)
)
)

ORDER

Plaintiff Diane I. Arrington has filed a Motion for Reconsideration of this Court's July 10, 2014, Order (Doc. 3) dismissing this action with prejudice. For the reasons stated herein, Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration will be denied.

A proper motion for reconsideration "must rely on one of three grounds: (1) an intervening change in controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence; or (3) the need to correct clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice." Lazaridis v. Wehmer, 591 F.3d 666, 669 (3d Cir. 2010) (citing N. River Ins. Co. v. CIGNA Reinsurance Co., 52 F.3d 1194, 1218 (3d Cir. 1995)). To the extent that the Court understands the contents of the disjointed motion, Plaintiff has not identified any intervening change in controlling law or any new evidence nor has she demonstrated a need to correct a clear error of law. It appears that she implores the Court to prevent manifest injustice related to various persons and institutions Plaintiff feels are targeting her and/or her family. For the jurisdictional reasons stated in the Court's July 10, 2014 Order, the Court is not in a position to grant Plaintiff's motion. Accordingly, there is no basis for reconsideration, and Plaintiff's motion is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

April 27, 2016

s\Cathy Bissoon

Cathy Bissoon

United States District Judge

cc (via ECF email notification):

All counsel of record

cc (via First-Class U.S. Mail):

ANDREW J. ARRINGTON, SR.

DIANE I. ARRINGTON

1247 Hillsdale Ave. Pittsburgh, PA 15216